UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Liberalism and the Individual - - - - - - - - - - *Kenneth L. Patton*

Modern Man Is Vulnerable - *Paul Meadows*

Do You Really Know Your Minister? - - - - - - - - - - *John Parke*

British Labor Prejudice - - *Devere Allen*

Atom Bond - - - *Sheldon Shepard*

Lewis Mumford's Philosophy and Program - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVIII NUMBER 3

Chicago, September-October, 1952

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*
Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Re-entry as Second-Class Matter pending at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor of *Worldover Press,* Wilton, Connecticut.

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor in George Williams College, Chicago.

C. A. Hawley: Head of the Department of English Literature, Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kansas.

Albert C. Knudson: Dean Emeritus of Boston University School of Theology.

Paul Meadows: Professor of Sociology in The University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

John Parke: Assistant Professor of Mathematics in a southern college.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of Charles Street Universalist Church, Boston, Massachusetts.

Sheldon Shepard: President of the California Universalist Convention.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney and journalist.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 35

ARTICLES—

Liberalism and the Individual—KENNETH L. PATTON 36
Modern Man Is Vulnerable—PAUL MEADOWS 39
Do You Really Know Your Minister?—JOHN PARKE 41
British Labor Prejudice—DEVERE ALLEN 42
Lewis Mumford's Philosophy and Program—VICTOR S. YARROS 44

POETRY—

Atom Bond—SHELDON SHEPARD 43

STUDY TABLE—

Personalism Expounded—ALBERT C. KNUDSON 44
A Full and Fruitful Life—CURTIS W. REESE 45
Gospel Sources—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 45
Important New Books—C. A. HAWLEY 45
Insight into Catholicism—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 45

CORRESPONDENCE—

Language of World Democracy—GLENN P. TURNER 46

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 47

THE FIELD—

Guatemala Land Reform—*Worldover Press* 34

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Guatemala Land Reform

The Guatemalan Congress is getting its teeth into a project for agrarian reform which, if carried out, will have important consequences. The plan, drawn up by President Jacobo Arbenz and a group of cabinet ministers, has been discussed in no fewer than fourteen special meetings of the government.

The project proposes "to liquidate the feudal form of agrarian property and implant capitalistic methods of exploiting the land." It is definitely not, therefore, revolutionary in character, despite the reports of a highly colored nature concerning it which have been sent to some sections of the foreign press.

For example, the scheme prohibits the loss of independence by farm workers through loans made to them by employers; it bars the levying of assessments on the Indians, generally a depressed economic class; it does not permit payment for land by work or products. Similarly, it gets rid of a whole series of feudalistic remnants left over from the colonial epoch and a servile regime that continued from the time of independence almost to the present time.

Target of the reforms will be the untilled lands, those not cultivated directly by their owners, along with national and municipal properties. There are vast areas in Guatemala once owned by Germans, many of them absentee owners, which were confiscated during World War II. These will be brought under the new program.

There will be two significant exemptions in the bringing of land under the project. One is the land of the Indian communities. The other is land owned by capitalistic businesses which work by means of modern methods — thus saving the properties of the United Fruit Company, which until recently was at odds with Guatemalan government and labor. Through a fund called the "agrarian debt" — provided by returns from rents, penalties, utilities, etc., from the lands taken over —owners of the expropriated land will be paid, and aid given to the settler-farmers.

—Worldover Press.

UNITY

Volume CXXXVIII SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1952 No. 3

EDITORIAL

The current revival of interest in religion among non-professional theologians marks an advance over previous revivals in that it is almost entirely undogmatic, and non-Christian in any conventional sense of the term. Mr. Whittaker Chambers, one of the latest converts to religion, does not, so far as I recall, use the term Jesus at all in his *Witness*—a volume whose chief value is political, not theological. Most of the current enthusiasm over religion among reputable thinkers would be equally at home in the household of any of the ethnic religions of the world. In other words, the current revival is a revival of religion, not of Christianity. Moreover, it is not a revival of theology, but of mysticism. The term God is used in ways that would make shivers run up the spine of a conventional theologian. In this revival there is no such thing as a system of theology. Mysticism runs riot. In previous revivals, Edwards, Wesley, Whitfield, Campbell, and even Moody and Billy Sunday not only took specific doctrines for granted but insisted on their validity. Today hardly any reputable advocate of religion takes seriously the theological ravings of Billy Graham. It is not, I think, too much to say that we are witnessing the end of an era in religion—the passing of interest in theological systems and ethnic religions as such. Similarly, we are witnessing the end of an era in the interpretation of the nature of the Church. By social scientists the Church is now thought of as a social institution subject to the same laws that govern the development, the functioning, and the waning of other social institutions. Hardly any reputable thinker today regards the Church as a gathering of the elect and governed by divine laws. All of which is to point out the opportunity that confronts Liberals and particularly Humanists in today's state of religious flux. Intellectuals who are breaking away from orthodox religion need help to save themselves from floundering in the morass of mysticism, obscurantism, and sentimentalism. They need to have it pointed out to them that religion is the organization of one's life around compelling ideals and the commitment of one's self to causes that are deemed worthy of one's best endeavor. It will be a satisfaction to the intellectually emancipated to know that they can be genuinely and deeply religious without having to accept outmoded and prescientific views of the nature of Man and the Universe. This is no time for Liberals and Humanists to be discouraged. It is a time for them to march like an army with banners into the midst of the confusion of our times, and proclaim that religion pure and undefiled is for men to walk intelligently with one another and to keep themselves unspotted from theological mysticism.

Curtis W. Reese.

Liberalism and the Individual

KENNETH L. PATTON

There is a disconcerting tendency among those known as liberals to give increased importance to solidarity and institutional strength. Perhaps this is a defense against the presumed strength and threat of totalitarian and reactionary social forces. If so, then the liberal is succumbing to the use of his opponent's weapons, and his defeat is sure. Hitler once declared that even though he might lose the war he would win the ideological battle. Surely the totalitarian tendencies in the democracies give potency to his boast.

The predominant strength of the liberal and democratic way of life lies in its emphasis on the worth and the self-determinancy of the individual. Once the liberal forsakes this emphasis and begins to yearn for the satisfactions and the safety of the herd life, he has lost the genius and the unique validity of his philosophy. The critical and creative faculties of the individual mind and personality are the key value of the liberal spirit. These faculties can best be nourished in a society that prizes and encourages the independent growth of its individuals. Conformity is scorned as the safeguard of weakling societies that have not yet learned that the strength of any group finally depends upon the resourcefulness and self-sufficiency of its individual members.

There are several giveaways that indicate the loss of this central conviction among liberals so-called. One of these is an increased impatience with, even a fear of, controversy and differences of opinion. Why are the Universalists and Unitarian churches so concerned over disagreements between their members and churches? Only persons and institutions that are insecure fear variety of opinion. Why be concerned over the theist-humanist wrangle? Of late many of the middle-of-the-roaders are taking a morally superior attitude to anyone so ill-mannered as to get involved in a theological debate. They seem to fear that this indicates a threat to the vitality and cohesiveness of the denominations. They shudder when there are news stories about controversy at conventions. Why should liberal denominations care what orthodox bodies think of their airing of differences? Do we secretly crave the cozy and sweaty compactness of the conservative sects? Are we so personally insecure that we no longer dare to stand up with our personal views and challenge the mob?

The increasing strength and concentration of headquarters organizations, the gathering emphasis on denominational programs and support, indicate the growing functional conservatism of the liberal groups. Our virtues and values are becoming rapidly indistinguishable from those of the orthodox bodies. We are neurotically concerned with size, with statistics on the growth of membership, the sums of our donations, number of new churches, number of subscribers to magazines, making the best-seller lists in publishing. We exhibit our symptoms via petty exaggerations and braggadocio, resembling nothing so much as a little man who wears elevator shoes and a cocky air. We have lost the true liberal's fear of bigness with its threat to the freedom of the individual and the minority group. Now we want nothing so much as to be identified with bulk and with the majority. This we find by nestling up to the hairy sides and the full teats of the great sows of society, big business, the military organization, the state, the school system, and a rapidly centralizing Protestantism.

There is a more subtle disintegration at work in our midst, which has typically come wearing the dress of the savior. It comes in the name of the strengthening of the democratic process itself. It is known as group thinking. Its considerable threat lies in its considerable value. It has not yet sufficiently developed its theory and practice to make it a great threat. Its symptomatic importance is what is disturbing. That we should *want* to think as groups demonstrates the decay of our personalities. That we wish to mix our thoughts as people mix their breath and their odors in a crowded room indicates an unhealthy and perverse loosening of the nobility of individualism. We are on our way to the human ant hills, where thought will be reduced to the typed responses of the pattern-man.

We can watch the process demonstrated in our friends. The person who was a staunch rebel when he was out on his own as a layman or a minister of a local church is vested with the dubious glory of a position at "headquarters." He is now a party-man, and he soon acquires what a friend of mine calls the headquarters look. He identifies himself with the assumed importance and power of headquarters. No longer is he mere John Doakes, but he is *the* president, *the* secretary. He no longer makes his decisions as an individual and according to his own insights and values. Now he must behave as a member of the team. Whereas before one could trust him to speak his mind frankly, now a subtle dishonesty has entered his discourse, because he tends to say the politic thing rather than the true thing. He begins to use his former colleagues, to tell them only as much as is good for them to hear, to maneuver them when they come to him for his services. The liberal has become a politician. Even so do liberal institutions tend to become political institutions, and to let considerations of mass and power take precedence over concern for the individual, his welfare and freedom.

These considerations have been plaguing me for some time. The trigger that set them off was an article by Philip Schug in the May-June, 1951, issue of UNITY on "Beyond Uniformity." Disturbingly echoed there were many of the symptoms that have been more and more evident in our midst. In fact, Schug sees as a basic problem in religion the need for the very thing which I most fear. He puts his case in seemingly positive and wholesome terms, which makes it all the more dangerous. This is the great peril in the threat that faces the liberal spirit, that it comes in the guise of a cure for our sickness, when in fact it bears the germs of the death of liberalism.

The problem that concerns Schug is "the problem of successfully living together." What about the problem of successfully maintaining personal integrity and convictions in an age of snow-balling totalitarianism? No, our problem is how we, too, may become more centripetal and create our own eddy of social cohesive-

ness and conformity. Schug frontally attacks the idea that men can "be religious alone." True, we must live in society, but is not the essence of religion, as Whitehead so defined it, what we do with our aloneness? Schug doubts "if there has ever been a person who was religious by himself." He continues:

> In its very essence the term "religion" signifies a living together, and those devotions, those aspirations, that we cherish as our own, and to which we would give our very lives if it were necessary, are not our own except in the sense that we participate in them. . . . Slowly do these developments come, very slowly, and the life of man is short and transient by comparison.

The implications here are shocking. They are flatly against the previous individualism that was the seed of the Protestant revolution. The above words could be rapturously affirmed by the most orthodox Roman Catholic. Man cannot be religious by himself. He can be religious only in and through the church. He must be within the family of the faith, for the great affirmations which he makes as a religious man are not his except as he takes part in the life of the church community. The life of the Church is long; a thousand years are as a day unto the Lord and the Church. His meaning is to be found only within the ongoing society. And have not the political totalitarians said that the individual has no meaning except as a member of the state?

I would contradict these conclusions flatly. No man is profoundly and significantly religious except when he is "alone." That is, it is in his most private, most personal, most intuitive moments, when a man is searching himself and his universe for his own inherent meaning and worth that he is most pertinently religious. Extrovert religion is superficial by necessity. It is concerned with social and public performances and values. This makes it pervasively conservative, for it is in our public lives that we submit most easily to group coercion and conformity. If a man is religious, his values, even though they may have been introduced to him via the group life, must be substantiated by his personal and immediate experience and convictions. In a real sense no man participates in the group life until he has made it his own, until he has experienced it anew within himself. He does not so much participate in values as he recreates them in his own private experience.

The strength of the values of the group depends on the private experience and conviction within its constituent individuals. Schug makes the individual dependent rather upon the group. It is this dividing line of emphasis that clearly defines whether we are drifting toward herdism or individualism.

Schug pictures the individual as dependent on the long-term evolutionary development of society. Undoubtedly society carries the values inherited by each new generation. But just as significantly society depends upon individuals for its values, for it is the individual rebel and prophet and moral inventor who, often millenia in advance of the slow evolution of the race, announces the moral necessities of the group life. No one has improved upon the criticism of war given by Laotzu 2,600 years ago. Is the liberal minister who joins the chaplaincy more realistic, going along with the bloody and tedious evolution of the war-making nations?

No liberal can live by the standards and ideals of the masses. "What virtue have ye? Do not even the Gentiles the same?" Creative morality is always individualistic. If it is not hung upon one man alone, it is hung upon small minority groups who can sustain themselves only through the individualistic vigor and self-sufficiency of their intransigent members. Schug claims that these values we prize "have slowly and painfully developed in the matrix of dynamic living." A pretty theory, and in a sense true. But centuries and millenia before crucial moral issues become the present concern of social groups, of the Church and the State, they are born in the erupting intuition of prophets and poets, and are painfully carried by rebels and heretics who dare protest against the tedious stupidity and cruelty of the tribe.

One of the most significant indications in Schug's article is that he carries his discussion almost exclusively upon the political and institutional level. He accepts, as all liberals must, the shifting of power to make decisions and policies to the people, to the individual man and woman, rather than having them imposed from above. His concern is with the health and strength of democratic institutions, which must depend upon the "conscience and responsibility" of their members. All agree that they must be able to be "frank and open in the expression of ideas and filled with mutual respect and confidence," having a "healthy unity" which will enable them "to act as responsible individuals without flying apart and destroying the organization by [their] non-participation or by [their] non-democratic participation." If you are going to have democratic institutions these are prerequisites. But note again the emphasis upon the stability of the institution which must be served by the individuals, rather than turnabout.

Schug defines as "non-coöperative citizens" those who will not submit gracefully to a majority decision. He sees the scene changed when the individual has the privilege of sharing in the shaping of policy through democratic process, as against the right of rebellion against autocracy. If one is a functioning member of a democratic group, then, says Schug, "he has no right to refuse to coöperate, whether his ideas are accepted or not." Does this mean that the individual must submit to the "tyranny" of the majority? What happens to the rights of the minority to stand opposed to the majority decision? Can there be no revolution against stupid and vicious majorities in democracies, as against tyrannous autocracies? How would Jefferson react to this pronouncement?

But Schug turns the censure on the stubborn individual. "If he refuses to coöperate, he is by that act attempting to bludgeon the rest of us into accepting what we may have turned down after due consideration." Oh, the poor majority being "bludgeoned" by the recalcitrant individual who will not kneel to the group superiority of their conclusions! What power does this person have over the group, who outnumber him and overpower him? And yet Schug continues: "He is by that act behaving in an autocratic and totalitarian manner, and if he succeeded in whipping the rest of us into line our position would not only be the proverbial 'hell on earth,' but our democracy would be effectively destroyed." Lo and behold, the great danger of the subversive individual to the liberal church being announced with all the stentorian warning of a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

I do not fear the continued existence of democratic institutions under the onslaught of the non-coöperative

citizens. I fear the preservation of the freedom of men of independent mind under the domination of majority rule in so-called democratic institutions which tend to grow more and more totalitarian in philosophy and practice. The free and fearless, the rebellious individual is more important to society in the long run than the existence of any particular institutional body or structure within society. If the free individual must be destroyed in order to preserve free institutions, the debacle of democracy is imminent.

Schug proposes several cures for our democratic ill-health. Self-examination is the first, and is of course unarguable. The second is to confer with others relating to our own decisions. Schug praises the conference table as a means of acquiring common sense. My own experience is that the conference table usually produces conformity on some common denominator always below that of the thinking of the most creative and intelligent members of the group. Perhaps this is common sense. Here we can "learn to compromise." Should free individuals compromise on basically important issues? Or is not the free society an arrangement permitting the greatest possible range of diversity of belief and behavior without the deadening necessity of compromise? In compromise both parties give up something. Max Otto proposes creative idealism in which a new solution is sought in case of a conflict of desires, in which no one must sacrifice desires and ideals, but will possibly find a more satisfactory solution than either originally anticipated. I find the Quaker ideal of consensus much more creative than that of compromise.

Schug praises the virtues and pleasures of compromise, the "real joy derived from successful coöperation." Nothing is said of the joy of the creative activity of the individual. He wants "a complete reliability" of the individual to the group. Can a free man ever be completely reliable in terms of the expectancy of other individuals and groups? What if he changes his mind, or disagrees? Is this not putting the group above the person? His fourth charge is that we find a sense of purpose. Agreed. But what if that sense of purpose drives us to work against the group, which may seem to us to be moving against, rather than toward, the proper destiny of the race? What about the sense of purpose of the pacifist relating to the sense of purpose of the nation at war?

Is the institution the agency whereby the salvation of the individual will be assured? Or must the creative individuals always be, in some sense, at war with all, even the best-intentioned, of institutions? Should we, as liberals, focus our efforts on the development of institutions primarily, or on the developments of free personalities primarily? This question does not imply that we should disregard either, but where should our foremost emphasis and efforts be applied? Should we fear what the individual might do to the institution more than we fear what the institution might do to the individual?

Here is Schug's idea of Utopia:

> Think of the pleasure that could be derived from living in church or in a society in which men and women could speak their minds openly, could solve their problems in concert, and in which persons were large enough to take present defeat of a pet idea with a smile! It would be almost heaven on earth.

He is talking about a "heavenly institution," is he not? Notice the tacit assumptions. What problems can be solved in concert? Social or group problems. What about the many, and more important problems, that each person must decide in and for himself? I shudder to think of ever arriving at the stage where I would "take the present defeat of a pet idea with a smile." When can that happen to an individual? Only when he depends on the group to carry out his pet idea. What if that idea is the most important thing in that person's life? Should he give up with a smile? Or should he leave the group and work on it alone or with whomever will go him? Is his range of operation and his range of idealistic and visionary growth to be limited by any group that he happens to be associated with? This is a tremendous issue, and Schug seems to infer that the individual should submit to defeat by the majority, take it with a smile, and be a nice little coöperative citizen.

Shades of Jesus, Socrates, Amos, and Tom Paine! If the group does not want my pet idea, that is their business. I will then leave them to their tame little "heaven on earth." I will work it out on my own. The great creative ventures are almost always individualistic. Some individual, often in isolation and disgrace, works the thing out within himself. Few great creative masterpieces are joint creations. Imagine Beethoven collaborating on a symphony? Or Michelangelo on a statue? Helpers Michelangelo had, but they were ruled by his vision and judgment, and needfully so. Perhaps some of Shakespeare's plays were joint projects, but Macbeth and Hamlet bear the indelible marks of the designing, integrating, stylizing force of a master individual. Committees never produce masterpieces. They are more likely to spawn the nonentities of group thinking.

Creative force finally resides in the individual creator, even in science. Einstein owed much to other mathematicians, but his magnificent conclusions were born after many years of personal creative struggle. Imagination is always individual. No committee of architects, such as produced the antiseptic, social, and characterless structures of Rockefeller Center and the UN buildings, could ever produce the unique greatness and beauty of a Frank Lloyd Wright building. When liberals begin to worship the committee, their genius and their greatness will have been spent.

Schug closes his article with the analogy of the orchestra and the free society. This is an unhappy illustration. The great conductors are complete tyrants, and their players submit only because they know that a great musical expression must come from the creative and integrating expression of an individual, in this case the conductor. So they submit their wills, their taste, their judgment to him for the sake of the common expression. But how many great symphonies were composed by committees? And no great conductor will be dominated by a committee, either. And what about the solo musician? The solo musician, a creative interpreter in his own right, often finds being the member of an orchestra and being dominated by the conductor intolerable.

Have you ever noticed the fact that when a great soloist plays with a symphony, the conductor lets the soloist lead and supports him? For the orchestra and the conductor are then only the accompanists of the creative individual.

There are occasions in life when we must behave as members of a symphony, but even then there must be a dominant individual directing the orchestra, and such leaders can be found only where the growth of the individual is cherished. But there are many cases

where the race needs great individuals, composers, poets, artists, engineers, architects, inventors, scientists, prophets. The free society is strong because it develops free men, and free institutions are important only as instruments in producing free men. If these institutions get in the way of the development and expression of the individual, he should then circumvent them, avoid them—if need be, destroy them—not only for his own sake, but for their threat to the freedom of all the citizens.

If democracies ever lose the fear of their own bigness, their own potential tyranny by majority rule, they will be on their way to totalitarianism. Totalitarianism is possible in those democracies where institutions have become more important than the people, and the people can be enslaved to the state for the announced purpose of their own salvation. But when men are placed above the state, and the freedom and self-expression of each man is held the highest good of all, then men will never be deluded that they can find salvation through the panaceas of committees, institutions, churches, and governments.

Modern Man Is Vulnerable

PAUL MEADOWS

Shortly after the close of the second World War a New York editor set people across the nation talking about a powerful editorial, later expanded to a brief book. I refer to Norman Cousins and his *Modern Man Is Obsolete*. This arresting title adumbrated the threat to man's existence which was contained in the atomic bomb.

Since then, modern men by the millions have showed little evidence that they were much concerned about their becoming obsolete. On the contrary, if the mounting stockpiles of A-bombs mean anything, they indicate that we have indeed connived at our own demise.

Beyond the physical annihilation inherent in the bomb, there is the menace, fully as lethal, in the vulnerability of modern man as a dweller in organized societies.

The conquest of atomic energy was the fruit of a disciplined, highly organized, and far-flung collective effort. The engineering genius of modern man in all of its many specialized departments—physical, mental, governmental, financial, technological—was levied upon in order that the first ominous bomb-burst might take place. It was not enough that in making the bomb we made ourselves infinitely more vulnerable than ever before in our history. In so doing we actually professionalized our vulnerability! In this, our newest threat to modern man, we sought out, pooled, and refined all the professional skills known to modern men in order to extend the range of our vulnerability. That is to say, we organized our vulnerability.

The mushrooming cloud at Los Alamos, at Hiroshima, at Bikini, and at any other future experimental or military testing ground, is an image, dark and forbidding, of the existence of modern man. For the A-bomb is an outgrowth of our organized ways of living. It is itself the harvest, by no means random but calculated with fabulous professional ingenuity, of all the arts of organized living today. And the sole significant effect of it is to threaten to wipe out significance. Designed as a weapon of invulnerability, it has rendered us incredibly vulnerable.

It is impossible to find a more poignant symbol of the life of modern man. All the resources of science and technology, of government and authority, of social and economic organization we have forged into this revolutionary weapon, but this our Frankenstein creature symbolizes for us only a new vulnerability, a thousandfold more deadly than the menace from which we were seeking sanctuary.

It is not the first time that our search for sanctuary has created nightmares where there were only bad dreams. The collective arts of discovery and invention perfected the machine, and now we fight against the vulnerability of mass unemployment and machine displacement. The collective arts of specialization and division of labor engineered a new economy, industrialism, but in the midst of our fragmented and scattered interests we must seek for a new unity of common interests that can bind us into a human community. The small, parochial village surrendered dominion to the megalopolitan city, and the human measure lost its usefulness in a megalonthropic age. Small and self-sufficient states coalesced into vast, interdependent nation-states, and the autonomy and peace of the parts are swallowed up in the uninterrupted crises and tensions of the whole.

All our advances in the arts of human society are defended and have been hailed as new bulwarks of human security. And yet in daily fact they cast dark, long shadows across the future edges of our experience. The more intricate the organization, the more easily it is disrupted; the more massive the scale, the more sweeping the telltale consequences. In organization we have tried to protect and promote our individualities, and we find them engulfed by the demands and exactions of our collectivities. Mass has assumed the significance which once dwelt in the individual, and shrunken egos must find solace in swollen coffers and momentous issues. It is easy to attack the integrity of nations, to decry the inconsistencies of corporations, to castigate the contradictions of groups, but the quiet integrity of a man's own life seldom can withstand the shocks of the tiniest and most timid assertion of personal conscience. The glorious cause and the monumental decisions dwarf the austerities of a single human defiance. The inspired protest is lost in the labyrinths of administrative protocol and hierarchical disavowals. Form must substitute for feeling, and the priestly rituals of collective self-interests quench the fires of prophetic judgment. The expert, the technician, the artist in obscurities replace the armed vision. Where men were once persons, they are now members, and they must, according to the pathetic irony of human involvements, live within group walls that always shut out far more than they shut in.

In organization, modern man has sought to explore the outermost ranges of his collective capacity, but in so doing he finds it difficult, perhaps impossible, to

restore his powers as an individual human being.

Consider the problem of human loyalty.

Among tribal peoples loyalty is simply and easily defined—to the tribal gods, rituals, mores, routines, lineage group. But how can the loyalty of modern man ever be so simply and easily defined?

For the social universe of modern man is a pluriverse. Our living is identified with a meshwork of groups and interests and causes. In associations we name our loyalties. In groups we forge the links that bind. In causes we are knit to issues and ideas that transcend the day-by-day involvements of living. In interests we pursue goals that may have no roots in principles. Herein lies the difficulty of the modern man's loyalties. There are so many of them, and they exist in so many different varieties. They often compete with one another by day; and if not by day then by night in the unconscious strivings, like Jacob with his angel, they clash for possession of our souls. Our group memberships time and time again force us into acquiescence in decisions in which we were not consulted, perhaps in which we have been defied as well as ignored. In anger we may denounce that neglect while doing violence to even more fundamental loyalties.

In what ways can modern men lay claim freely and honorably on their loyalties? For we know we should be able freely and honorably to stake them out and declare them. Indeed, we experience the greatest security of our living in the loyalty that stands unimpeachably and imperishably clear and firm. But where and how can we discover such free and honorable loyalties? If we join this group, we cannot share in that; if we hold this faith, then we must deny that; if we cherish this value, then we must reject that; if we prize this way, then we must spurn that. Nor is that all. By affirming our loyalty to this or that principle or program or cause, we usually find that semantic subterfuges, legal technicalities, judicial sonorities, legislative "whereases," and administrative procrastination have repudiated, where they have not humiliated, our loyalties.

A case in point is the McCarran Act. Bureaucratic predilection and inclusive but ambiguous law make a farce of membership. Admitted membership, concealed membership, past membership in a party or in a group now under fire are no less censured and actionable than assumed membership, or likely membership, or reputed membership, or imputed membership, or membership in a group with sympathies paralleling at some past or present or possible future points the sympathies of a hated group.

But the anomaly of modern loyalties goes far beyond our contemporary secularized witchcraft. In an organized society modern man protects and promotes his particular interests through organized groups. But now any group membership, imputed or established, can be rendered suspect. Any loyalty can be defined as disloyalty, any conscience as the lack of it. The only conformity that can survive the merciless fire of privileged criticism can be only the most universal, the most flattened out, the least assertive, the most innocuous and mediocre conformity. Heresy is the idea hated by men who have no ideas. Bigotry becomes the *deus ex machina* of a machine-processed acquiescence. And in an age of conformity, bigotry—"the appalling frenzy of the indifferent," as Chesterton called it—slashes out at the "heretical" novelty, the "traitorous" sensitivity, the "treasonable" criticism. In numbers, it seems, there is safety for very little—save numbers!

We have indeed industrialized our vulnerability: we have mass-produced it, standardized it, serialized it, streamlined it, mass-merchandised it. And in such a society every bounding line becomes a boundary, every affection an alienation, every inclusion an exclusion, every approach a withdrawal, every sympathy a suspicion, every faith a heresy.

In face of such systematized and organized vulnerability, where can modern man find sanctuary?

Some of our oldest records of human living show that man very early set aside a place, a holy place, a sanctuary, where he might find refuge. In the long, long history of man many kinds of sanctuary have served this need for a defense against the cringing vulnerability of his life. But throughout and in whatever form, one fixed idea has dominated: sanctuary is found in that which is holy and sacred. In the holy and sacred, men have sought to reduce, even to deny or to defy, their vulnerability.

Sometimes sanctuary has been a person, divine or human; sometimes, an absolute idea, or cause, or group, or institution. Oftentimes a principle, a creed, a faith has thrown a protective covering over the vulnerable human being. Again, an all-embracing love, tradition, passion have shielded men against the insidious and pervading disaster. Sanctuary is literally where you find it, and when it is found its sacredness has sheltered men from the open skies of attack.

For sanctuary is an attitude of mind. It is an attitude which says something a man must have that is sacred, something a man must have that is holy. A man, modern or primitive, cannot live without that insistence. For with no sanctuary a man is as nothing. With no holy place there is no significance to which a man can cling and assert his humanity.

It perhaps comes down to this. The greatest vulnerability that can happen to man is the belief that nothing is sacred, neither human life nor any human life, neither human conviction nor any human conviction, neither human faith nor any human faith, neither this nor that; nothing. The greatest vulnerability that can befall us is our unquestioning and unquestioned dependence upon form to do the work of feeling, upon coercion to do the work of conscience, upon authority to do the work of truth, upon size to do the work of sensitivity, upon fear to do the work of faith. Where there is such thinking there is indeed no sanctuary, no sacredness, no holiness; only a dreadful and inescapable vulnerability.

Freedom to Create

What if the world has no plan or purpose? Must that question be answered? I should prefer to discover myself in a world that is without a plan that is preordained. If an omniscient and omnipotent deity has made his completed plan for creation from the beginning, and is carrying it out according to the preordained program, what am I but his plaything? On the other hand, if, in the fortuitous course of events, or in the working out of a purpose that is struggling into being, mankind has come into a world that is without a finished plan, then man can be, in part at least, a creator of his own destiny. In that case it matters much how I live, for I may be turning the course of fate.

—*Arthur Morgan.*

Do You Really Know Your Minister?

JOHN PARKE

It took a minister and his training group a thousand miles from home to make me thoroughly aware of the easy and stimulating friendship that can exist between a man and his minister. It was my first year in graduate school and I had arrived on the campus of a large university—feeling very much alone, being so far from home for the first time.

That first Sunday night I drifted down to the church —through force of habit, I must confess—hardly expecting to find a very congenial group in this strange and distant place. Much to my pleasure I was met promptly at the door, receiving a handshake that I shall always remember with special delight. After the group had made me begin to feel right at home, someone said: "We can't wait to have you meet Shorty, our minister of students, who meets with us every Sunday night."

What kind of young people are these, I thought, who call their minister Shorty? It sounded a bit disrespectful, if not irreverent; but all the same I could not wait for Shorty to make his appearance. While all was quiet for a moment I thought of the minister in my own church and wondered if he had friends among his own congregation who felt free enough to call him by a nickname. Then a startling thought struck me. Had I, being somewhat reserved by nature, been guilty of not meeting my pastor halfway in this business of being friends in the warmest and truest sense of the word?

I recalled that my own pastor was, like all other ministers, a very busy man; and that I had had the notion, mistaken though I now know it to be, that he would not appreciate burdening himself with something that would just take up more of his time. So, despite the fact that he was always most cordial, I suddenly realized that I had missed an opportunity in not making an effort really to know him as a friend.

While these disturbing thoughts were going through my mind, in walked a tall (six-foot-three), distinguished-looking man with a shock of white hair, and small blue eyes that had a perpetual twinkle. "Hi, Shorty," several people called out, and Shorty walked into our midst, greeting each one by his first name. When introduced to me he called over my name slowly; and if I were to see him again now, after four years away from his city, I am quite sure he would greet me without having to search his mind for my name even for a moment: "Hello, John!" And I could respond with naturalness and pleasure, "Hello, Shorty!"

But I could not call him Shorty at first. The idea that it was somehow disrespectful and irreverent clung to me; and it was only after I had learned to appreciate a truer and fuller friendship that I realized that he really could never be other than Shorty. The name was an integral part of his person.

Thanks to Shorty's wise words and living example, I came to realize what I myself could do toward knowing my minister better. I shall always be sorry that I did not have the opportunity when I returned home of cultivating the friendship of the unusual pastor we had had when I left. He had been called to another church in the meantime and a new man had come to fill his place. I resolved then to go halfway or over to make up for what I had been missing by not getting to know my pastor well.

Being married by this time, I had an even better opportunity to get to know the new pastor and his family. My wife saw at once many small things we could do for them in their new home. We found that, with all the visiting he does himself, a preacher likes to *be* visited occasionally. So we made it a point to call on the new minister and his family, not waiting for them to visit us. After all, *they* were the newcomers to town; and they seemed to appreciate our visit all the more on this account. I could not help recalling the time when I had thought it would be an imposition to take up a preacher's little free time with a social visit.

My wife started the practice of inviting the pastor and his family to simple suppers at our house. Not one of those dinners where you try to outdo someone else whom the pastor has visited recently, but a simple meal that can be shared in easy friendship and fellowship. It is at times like these that you can really get to know your minister and his family.

I have never been much of a fisherman, but once I invited our minister to a "pond draining" where he seined with my two brothers-in-law and me. Time was when I would have thought this an incongruous pastime for a preacher, but he seemed to enjoy it even more than I did. And I appreciated this opportunity to further a friendship that has meant much to me.

You might ask how one can have much personal contact with a minister in a very large church where he cannot be expected to know all of his church members by name, much less to know each one intimately. Not everyone, of course, would look for more than cordiality and a feeling of genuine interest on the part of their pastor in this case; but for those who would go farther there are church services and functions that are less well-attended than the regular Sunday morning worship service. In many places the midweek prayer service, being composed of a smaller group, affords an excellent opportunity to get closer to your pastor. There are other small groups, too, such as committee meetings, where you might find more intimate association with your pastor. You might invite the preacher, the next time you volunteer as delegate to an associational meeting, to ride in your car.

The benefits you can get from an intimate friendship with your minister are numerous. But do not think it will be a one-sided affair in which you do all the receiving. The minister will enjoy and benefit from it in return. He will tell you, after he knows you better, that this type of friendship is something that ministers cherish, but so often miss. This is not at all strange—ministers are human beings, too, you know. So do not let a busy life make your pastor seem unapproachable to you.

You may never have a pastor whom you can call "Shorty," and you may never cultivate the special kind of friendship that such a name goes with, but if you meet your minister halfway you will find him ready to be friends on a simple and sincere basis, to joke and be joked with, to share with you the little things that draw human beings together. Do not wait for him to seek you out. He is very busy, and does not want to be accused of showing partiality; but no one can honestly blame *you* for modestly seeking to know your pastor better.

British Labor Prejudice

DEVERE ALLEN

Widespread criticism has been levelled at British coal miners for their refusal to let Italian miners enter Britain in large numbers and help cure the continuing coal shortage. One of the critics was Paul R. Porter, a high E.C.A. executive in Europe. Porter said: "I fail to understand how 'full employment' could be advanced as a reason for not digging coal when unemployed Italian workers clamor for a chance to work in the coal mines."

No one can call Mr. Porter unfriendly to the British workers. A friend of this writer, he fairly glowed as he once told the story of Britain's unwillingness to let the United States divert coal shipments from the Continent during the terrible British winter of 1946-47. In sheer decency, the British felt that people on the Continent needed the coal as badly as they did. Standing half-frozen in the unheated hall of his apartment, Porter had to take a long time at the transatlantic telephone convincing Washington that the British meant what they said. "But they don't want the coal," he kept insisting. For this British spirit he was full of praise.

The time has arrived, in fact it arrived long ago, when not enough young men in Britain want to go into the coal pits as an occupation. Coal exports, once a source of national income, have dried up. There is not enough coal even for home consumption. Many experts believe that if it had not been for nationalization, the coal industry would have run short long ago. There are technical as well as labor reasons for the trouble, too; many mines near the surface have been worked out. But a lot of the difficulty just now is prejudice against Italian workers.

Here is a conflict between the individual or the trade union's attitude, and the needs of the country as a whole. Unless some way can be found to resolve this conflict, the end will be greater poverty for all hands. But in actual practice, the solution is far from simple. Labor always feels it has to wage a struggle for improved pay and conditions, and it invariably sees in the introduction of foreign workers a threat to its bargaining position, a position that is strengthened by a labor shortage.

Mexico had this trouble when the government sought to encourage Italian immigration. The unions thought their standards would be menaced by an influx of Italian laborers. Yet in its own turn, the United States has run into difficulties when it has imported Mexican workers through agreement of the two governments. United States labor has sometimes resented legitimate Mexican workers, north of the border for temporary jobs on the farms, almost as much as the wetbacks who ford the Rio Grande illegally. There are not enough hands for United States farms, yet the trade unions are afraid that a flow of Mexicans may force down their own pay and privileges.

In some instances the United States unions which oppose the use of Mexican labor cite the bad treatment of Mexicans as a further reason why they should not be imported. Some ill treatment there has been, yet Manuel Tello, Mexican Foreign Secretary, known to have pro-labor sympathies, says that less than 2 per cent of the Mexican workers have complained of bad conditions.

British government sources say that only 1,300 Italian workers have been admitted for work in the mines. Of these, 300 are already in the pits, while an equal number are training for coal mining. In a few areas, the British unions have voted to admit the Italians, but in far more cases they have voted "No" by an overwhelming majority. Sometimes this negative attitude appears to be based on a simple prejudice against Italians as foreigners. But mainly it is the old fear lest a lot of new hands lower wages, or at least stand in the way of a raise. There is muttering, too, about "new brooms sweeping clean." The Italians in the pits seem bent on working like demons. In one place where they were set to work making coal briquets, on piece rates, they started at once to break all production records. In their minds were their needy families back in Italy, desperate for every penny. It has been necessary for the authorities themselves to hold the Italians back from working sixteen hours a day. The British miner, doggedly trying to keep working in a hard job, and one in which danger attends a reckless work effort, can hardly be expected to welcome such Italian zeal.

Some miners in Britain have long since conquered their antiforeign prejudices, and have been working shoulder to shoulder with Poles, Czechs, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, and others. But to many miners the coming of the Italians was the last straw. This is primarily an individual reaction, for some of the miners' union leaders have shown a national and even an international spirit. But neither in Britain nor in a lot of other places have the workers been able to see such problems in the large. They are no better and no worse than most of us. But it is a pity that while we talk of the "one world" we want, or of the "free world" we hope to preserve, our minds are often fragmented by personal considerations. It is always hard to see the forest for the trees, when we are leaning on a favorite old tree to hold us up.

The Gospel of Gandhi

The modern miracle of India's release from foreign rule needs to be kept constantly before us.

With enduring sympathy for all his fellowmen, Gandhi truly loved all. To the Great Soul no one seemed an enemy. He treated all as friends; some, to be sure, departing from friendly behavior because of conditions which made them selfish and brutal. But never would Gandhi allow himself to become infected with unfriendliness! In the midst of privation and danger, in the face of violent attack on his people, he remained calm and unafraid, communicating to his followers his abundant love for all mankind.

Can this spirit of universal friendship live and grow in the world? Can the people of the whole world learn from this wonderful example how the superhuman in man can overcome anger and fear?

This Truth is religion at its best. From Gandhi, as from Jesus and other teachers, we can learn the Love that is God.

HERBERT STURGES.

Atom Bond

SHELDON SHEPARD

That was more than a bomb we dropped on Hiroshima.
Yes this was different.
It was the turning of matter into the unseen!
Reversal of the process of creation, this was.
That which it touched is gone, disappeared, is nothing,
Vaporized, etherized, atomized, gone.
Damage of that which remains
Is but the trail it leaves in passing.

This was not an ordinary explosion, a spreading-apart;
This was disintegration,
A changing of the course of creation,
A splitting of that whose coming together is all there is—
Tearing, ripping, pounding, pulverizing all things that seemed substantial,
Converting them to its own wild nature,
Showing there is no substance in them
Except in the coming-togetherness.

It was Creation showing how the sun is built;
It was the universe revealing itself to man
And saying, "All power is one power."
This was the universe declaring that it will do anything to keep on its way,
To do that which it set out to do.
Let man work with it
And all power is his.
Let him work against it
And it will be like death and despair over Hiroshima.

It was the answer to those who would stop the process of evolution
And try to set it in reverse;
To those who toy destructively with any power;
Who think they can go on dividing the earth—
Into empires and colonies, high and low, royal and common, princes and paupers, superior and inferior, owners and dispossessed, free and slave, palaces and slums, happy and miserable.
Those who think they can build for themselves estates of security
And let others do the trembling with fear and sobbing in sorrow—
This is their answer!

That heat at Hiroshima soldered the whole human race into one mass;
It clamped the wide world together—
Crushed it in the inescapable grip of a vise.
Squeezed it into a unity, a oneness unalterable.

We thought it was a bomb.

But it was more than a bomb; it was a bond,
That thing we dropped on Hiroshima.
Halfway around the world we went to drop it,
Because we thought it was a bomb;
Thought we would be safe then,
We and our cities, our children and our future,
Because this was only a bomb.

But it was more than a bomb; it was a bond.
It lashed out with its chain of smoke
And snared us, too.
Its light exposed the shame of the world in one awful second;
Its heat fused us all into one.

Now we are in it with the rest of them.
Everybody's fear is our fear,
And, more important still,
Everybody's hope is our hope.

Now everybody huddles, frightened, with us on one tiny shaking, shrinking island of existence.
Before this we thought we could destroy others and save ourselves.

Then the bond came—the bond—the atom bond.

"The process of creation is a bringing-together,"
Shrieks the bond.

Atoms, worlds, systems, galaxies, the universe—
A bringing together.

Personality, family, clan, community, nation, civilization, the world—
A bringing together.

On some levels we call it gravitation, on some magnetism, attraction.
On some we call it friendship, cooperation, good will, love—
A bringing together.

That was more than a bomb we dropped on Hiroshima;
It was a bond—
A bond that holds us tightly now in fear and insecurity,
Shouting, scheming, planning, dreading—
Us and everybody else.
And it will hold us in its solid grip—
Us and everybody else—
Until we all go down howling, wailing together—
We and everybody else—
Or see the light from Hiroshima,
And make our oneness a unity of hope, of peace, of plenty—
We and everybody else—
Working with the whole plan of progress and creation,
Working to unfold new paradises of human experience.

The bond will chain us all in one unified terror
Until we—
We and everybody else—
Wake up and see that
It was more than a bomb that dropped on Hiroshima.

It was a bond.

Proved Christianity

I was convinced—and I am so still—that the fundamental principles of Christianity have to be proved true by reasoning, and by no other method.

—*Albert Schweitzer.*

Lewis Mumford's Philosophy and Program

VICTOR S. YARROS

In Lewis Mumford we have, without doubt, one of America's major prophets. His booklet, *Faith for the Living,* published during the second World War, was an inspiring "treat for the times." He is erudite, independent, philosophical, and humane. He belongs to no school—he is neither a Socialist nor an Individualist-Anarchist. He approaches the difficult problems we face in the spirit and tone of Ruskin or William Morris, not of Marx, Webb, Shaw, or Attlee. His manifold indictment of the present social order is severe, stern, unsparing. But he presents no clear, systematic program for the future. He fears that our crisis may continue for several decades and bring forth "a succession of catastrophes," yet he has hope and discerns significant promises of a veritable "renewal of life," the emergence of a superior culture and a higher and truer civilization.

Many radicals will be disappointed in the solid and comprehensive volume entitled, *The Conduct of Life,* which is the culmination of his life work. They probably had expected a more constructive and definite solution of the economic problems, at least. What Mr. Mumford gives us is tentative, admittedly vague and too general. There are several wise and fine suggestions and many noble pages in the book, but they do not add up to a synthesis.

Here is a quotation which, in effect, sums up the author's conclusions:

> Western civilization needs something more than a drastic rectification of private capitalism and rapacious profiteering, as the Socialists believe; something more than the widespread creation of representative and responsible governments, as World Federalists believe; something more than the systematic application of science to social affairs, as many psychologists and sociologists believe; something more than a rebuilding of faith and morals, as religious people have long believed. Each of these changes might be helpful in itself; but what is even more urgent is that all changes should take place in an organic interrelationship. The field for transformation is not this or that particular institution, but our whole society; this is why only a doctrine of the whole, which rests on the dynamic intervention of the human person in every stage of the process, will be capable of directing it.

Mr. Mumford demands too much of the average "human person," who is certainly no superman. But he means what he says, and repeatedly predicts the failure of "the present piecemeal method of attack." Even the Communists and Marxists, he is convinced, must fail eventually because of their neglect of important aspects of the "human person"—such as the ethical and religious aspects. Just what the Fabian, evolutionary Socialists overlook, he does not tell us. We may infer, however, that in his view the Fabians are not sufficiently interested in esthetics, are too political and materialistic.

Neither the Fabians nor the Marxists will plead guilty to Mumford's charges. On the other hand, the advanced liberals will dismiss his point of view as rather sentimental and Utopian. It is not clear just how he would have us attack the whole existing order *simultaneously* on all fronts as well as from the rear and on the flanks. It is true, in one sense, that the great and high task of "renewing life," of subordinating the machine to the individual human being, of remolding and civilizing society, is a task of, and for, all thoughtful and responsible persons. But to recognize this truth is not to deny the need and importance of competent, sincere leadership, of initiative, of division of labor. The elite is always with us, but it does not consist of supermen, of aristocrats, of dictators. It is democratic, and it appeals to reason and conscience, not to force. It issues no orders; it persuades and points the way. It has mastered the art and strategy of rational compromise, of proper emphasis, of putting first things first, of approaching the right ideals gradually. Mumford is a member of the elite, but he is not a social engineer nor a statesman. His message is not invalid; it obviously requires qualifications and reservations. His logic is not the logic of life itself, of human experience.

The Study Table

Personalism Expounded

THE PERSON, OR THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MAN. *By Ralph Tyler Flewelling. Los Angeles: The Ward Ritchie Press. 339 pp. $4.00.*

Dr. Flewelling is widely known in philosophical circles, both at home and abroad, as the Editor of *The Personalist* and founder of the School of Philosophy in the University of Southern California. He has written many books, several of them large volumes, that have attracted wide attention. Of these the one just published is, in my opinion, the most important. It contains the most comprehensive and detailed exposition of the personalistic philosophy in its relation to both the theoretical and practical problems of life that has appeared in a single volume. This philosophy had its chief modern sources in Leibnitz, Berkeley, Kant, and Lotze; and its chief American exponent was Borden Parker Bowne, who is commonly regarded as the founder of American personalism.

To the exposition, practical application, and defense of this type of philosophical idealism, Dr. Flewelling has largely devoted his teaching and literary talents. Starting with the conviction that personalism is a faith and a life, not simply a philosophical theory, he has kept close to the needs and interests of the modern mind. He has made rich use of his own extraordinarily wide acquaintance with world history and literature. He has made significant contributions to the personalistic philosophy in the social and cultural fields. The theology which he has deduced from his philosophy is emphatically rational, freedomistic, liberal, and Neo-Arminian as opposed to Neo-Calvinistic. His literary style is smooth and felicitous, suggestive of a man of letters rather than of a technical philosopher.

The foregoing characteristics are descriptive of his books taken as a whole, and are also applicable in varying degrees to the present volume, which is destined to be a standard work in its field.

ALBERT C. KNUDSON.

A Full and Fruitful Life

THE PREACHER AND I. *By Charles Francis Potter. New York City: Crown Publishing Company, Inc. 429 pp. $4.00.*

Charles Francis Potter's most recent book, *The Preacher and I,* is a well-written and colorful autobiographical story of a venturesome life interestingly and courageously lived. The story moves from the thoughts and experiences of a young fundamentalist Baptist preacher to the reasoned faith and vigorous action of an apostle of advanced Humanism. The chapters on the Stratton-Potter Debates and on the Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee, are of permanent significance. The record of Dr. Potter's struggles with Boards of Trustees and individual persons is told with a maximum of objectivity. There were difficulties, or at least misunderstandings, with Boards of Trustees, and these are discussed with frankness and fairness. Dr. Potter's difficulties with the Church of the Divine Paternity in New York was apparently his most distressing experience, and his experience with the West Side Unitarian Church of New York was his most satisfying and successful pastorate. His experience with Antioch College and with its President, Arthur E. Morgan, is discussed in some detail. His chapter entitled, "I See a Man Electrocuted," is a powerful argument against capital punishment. His pioneering work in behalf of Birth Control, Euthanasia, and other social causes makes inspiring reading. As a lecturer and author, Dr. Potter has had wide contacts with persons and events. The sidelights on many important personalities of our time are revealing and instructive. The record shows Dr. Potter as a man of vision and action, of courage and daring, and a man who is willing to follow the inquiring method of science wherever it leads without regard to prejudices and taboos. No doubt the years ahead will add other chapters to an already full and fruitful life.

CURTIS W. REESE.

Gospel Sources

JESUS AND THE HIDDEN BIBLE: *A Study of Gospel Sources. By Joseph Krimsky. New York: The Philosophical Library. 79 pp.* $2.75.

PRIMITIVE GOSPEL SOURCES. *By P. W. B. Strather Hunt. New York: The Philosophical Library.* 344 *pp. Complete Index.* $6.00.

The first of these is a series of somewhat pleasing essays which "prove," what every well-informed person already knows, that "Jesus of Nazareth lived and died under the spell of Messianic hopes and aspirations." The "hidden Bible" upon which the work is based are some of the better known apocryphal and related literature. No recognition is given of the prophetic background which constitutes the basis of what was most significant and creative in Jesus. The author shows no evidence of the ability to handle his New Testament sources critically, but seems to write under the illusion that Jesus actually said everything attributed to him; even the more dubious parts of the Fourth Gospel.

Hunt's work is in an entirely different category. Here we have a thoroughly trained scholar who knows his sources and treats them with meticulous and critical care. The result is a thorough and comprehensive treatment of the Gospel sources. He is familiar with not only the early church fathers, but also the Dialogues, which give to his work a substantial basis rare outside of highly technical treatments. Hunt's high scholarship is sweetened by a conscious objectivity which is the more remarkable because of the deep convictions of the author. *Primitive Gospel Sources* is a really first class work which belongs in the library of everyone seriously concerned with a serious study of Jesus and the New Testament.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Important New Books

THE MODERN NOVEL IN AMERICA. *By Frederick J. Hoffman. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. 216 pp. $3.00.*

LOWELL AND FRANCE. *By Charles Oran Stewart. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. 136 pp. $2.50.*

MARY MCLEOD BETHUNE. *By Catherine Owens Peare. New York: The Vanguard Press. 219 pp. $2.75.*

ONE AND HOLY. *By Karl Adam. New York: Sheed and Ward. 130 pp. $2.00.*

Professor Hoffman discusses the present naturalist school in American fiction. Beginning with Norris, who believed the purpose of the novel was social, the development of the novel is traced adequately and well. Unusually good is the author's treatment of F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, and William Faulkner. Professor Stewart's study of the French influence on Lowell is long overdue. Lowell's interest in the French language and literature began when he was a small boy. From 1856 to 1877 he served as Professor of French at Harvard. One needs only recall Lowell's "The Cathedral," the "Ode to France," and the great essay on "Rousseau" to show the influence of France on American literature. One of America's noblest women, Mary McLeod Bethune, has at last found a worthy biographer. Born of slave parents, and one of seventeen children, Mary was reached by a mission school of the Presbyterian Church. She had a desire to learn, and by aid of scholarships she graduated from Scotia Seminary and from the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. With one dollar and a great faith, she founded a college for her people which today has developed into the famous Bethune-Cookman College. Everyone interested in better racial relations should read this book. Karl Adam, the well-known German theologian, has written a book which grew out of the turmoil of Europe. It is a reexamination of the possibility of a reunion of Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. The problems of Europe have compelled a closer relationship in order that each may survive.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Insight into Catholicism

A HANDBOOK OF THE PAPACY. *By Bishop William Shaw Kerr. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott. 18s.*

THE WALL OF SEPARATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE. *By Conrad H. Moehlman. Boston: Beacon Press. 239 pp. $3.00.*

COMMUNISM, DEMOCRACY AND CATHOLIC POWER. *By Paul Blanshard. Boston: Beacon Press. 340 pp. $3.50.*

Like other delicate issues, such as sex and race, the "Catholic problem" is now being openly discussed, and the above books are among the most useful for gaining insight. Bishop Kerr's book is a reasoned, careful, scholarly presentation of the Anglican position as op-

posed to that of Rome. He presents nothing especially new, but for those who wish to get this point of view in the compass of one volume, his book is indispensable. His scholarship and history are beyond reproach and, apart from little irritations which occasionally appear in his writings, would seem to settle the case. Unfortunately, however, historical fact bears little relationship to religious faith.

Moehlman focuses his very considerable historical knowledge upon the problem of Church and State, especially as it relates to the public schools. As a source of information for those concerned with preserving the status quo from Catholic efforts to extend their privileges and place in American life, his work is invaluable.

Paul Blanshard, as the one who cracked through the hush-hush policy of ignoring basic ecclesiastical issues, could hardly have avoided writing this book. The human tendency to believe that moral principles apply to other groups, but not to ours, needs constantly to be exposed. If dictatorship is an evil and a threat when it appears in the form of Fascism, Nazism, or Communism, so it is also when it appears in the form of ecclesiastical tyranny.

Neither in this book nor in his previous one has Blanshard made any major point not already well-known by all those who are informed of the history and practices of the Roman communion, including informed Catholics. Blanshard merely spells it out and marshalls the evidence.

This book should not be regarded only as an exposé of Vatican policies. It also contains excellent and careful discussions of communistic policies and procedures.

It is no depreciation of the immensely valuable services of Mr. Blanshard to say that the major problem still remains without adequate popular discussion. Why are people drawn to dictatorships? Why are they so little concerned about the ethics of any group which shows a capacity to secure and to exercise power? Why are liberal groups so unable to win widespread support? The success of Mr. Blanshard's Paul Revere warnings will depend primarily upon the depth of concern of the people for intellectual veracity and ethical values.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Correspondence

Language of World Democracy

To UNITY:

Because I am interested in world affairs—as who is not?—I read with interest the article in UNITY by Leland P. Stewart, entitled "World Religion."

I think the author is sound when he thinks that "necessity" compels some inventions to solve the problem of "increasing world strife."

Mr. Stewart then pays his respects to the idea of world government and says that attempts to establish world government are "worthwhile and inevitable" because some world government "must be established." The author then asks the question: "However, just when will the world at large recognize that the real core of lasting peace is not to be found in satisfactory governmental organizations, but in a workable religion?" My answer is *never.*

The difficulty which this question involves is that the author is using the word peace in two different senses. The word peace has several meanings. If he tried to translate his article into Esperanto he would find that the translation of the idea of "lasting peace" would be *paco,* that is the absence of war and of the preparation for war. And when he translated the word the next time he would use the word *trankvilo,* the peace of soul.

It seems to me that the author does the reader of UNITY a disservice when he mixes these two things up. If war and preparation for war are to continue until we have a world religion, then we might just as well save our money now going to the churches and put it into bomb-proof shelters, for there will certainly be a third, fourth, and other World Wars.

But this is not the truth. War and preparation for war can be ended. Peace (in the sense of the absence of war and preparation for war) will come to the world just as it has come to this continent. It will come when the nations are made into a federal union like the United States of America. For with the nations disarmed like our states are disarmed, with a legislative department working all the time on the passage of laws to promote the public welfare, with courts to interpret the law and an executive to enforce it, war will be impossible in the world just as it is impossible in the United States of America.

The matter of getting rid of certain concepts of some of the prescientific religions is only a matter of time. Some of us who were brought up in the old traditions of supernatural religion have had a struggle. But more and more people are coming to scientific positions, and when science and religion are saying different things they tend to accept what science says rather than religion. For them, religion becomes the "quest for the good life."

The Point Four program of President Truman points the way to building the good life for all. But a Point Four program can only be carried out in its fullness in a world which is without war and without preparation for war. A world with *paco,* in the Esperanto sense of the word. In such a world we can work out a world religion.

The connection of religion and language is very close. It is hard to think of the Roman Church without Latin, the synagogue without Hebrew, the religion of Confucius without Chinese. The religion of the future is, I think, bound up with the language of the future—Esperanto. Dr. Zamenhoff, when working on Esperanto, had in mind not only a language but a means to the end of developing a religion of humanity. He called it the *interna ideo.* While I do not deny the worth of this conception of Esperanto, I am more interested in Esperanto as the oil for the machinery of a World Federal Union. I think of Esperanto as the language of world democracy, as English has been the language of our national democracy.

Yours for a World Federal Union with Esperanto *now.*

GLENN P. TURNER,

Middleton, Wisconsin.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

FREEDOM MOVES WEST

The history of the Western Unitarian Conference was off the press in time for the Geneva Conference. It is an exciting, readable, and informative book. It should be in the library of every member of Western Conference churches. There are discounts for church book tables. Order now from the Conference Office.

PUBLICITY

Through a coöperative arrangement sponsored by the Conference Planning Committee, Mr. Edward Darling will spend several weeks during October visiting churches and area meetings. He will conduct seminars and workshops on Publicity and Public Relations. He has asked those who will be participating in these sessions to read *Is Your Publicity Showing?* by Alice Partlow Curtis. Copies are available through the Conference Office. Price, $2.00.

GENEVA

Three hundred and sixty-seven different persons participated in the Summer Assembly at College Camp on Lake Geneva, June 29-July 5. It was an outstanding conference. The stellar performance of Dr. Ralph K. Huitt, in explaining American politics and what makes it "tick," certainly enabled all of his hearers to better understand the interactive elements of the Republican and Democratic conventions as portrayed on television and radio. This information is proving invaluable to the understanding of the political campaign as it moves toward the climax. Many commented that the Huitt lectures alone were worth the effort, money and time. But there was "all this and heaven too." E. T. Buehrer's course on Heresy, Charles Phillips on Modern Philosophies, Munroe Husbands on Fellowship, Frances Wood on Religious Education, and Lois McColloch on Alliance Leadership provided everybody with double value. The Alliance and Religious Education workshops gave to some an additional dividend.

The AUY High School group was back with double the number of last year. Their program, under the direction of Max Gaebler with theme talks by Arthur Foote, provided inspiration and information for all. A good time was had by everyone, even when the steak-fry ended in a deluge.

Already people are asking about next year's Geneva Conference. The new Planning Council has been appointed and is organized. It consists of:

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Chairman
Howard Hauze, Vice Chairman
Mrs. Bernard Heinrich,
Secretary and Registrar
Randall S. Hilton,
Treasurer and Business Manager
Melvin Mather
Fritz Schaefer
Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.
Max Gaebler
Mrs. Ralph Hicks
Alfred Henriksen

This Planning Council will meet in Chicago on Friday and Saturday, September 26 and 27.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION COMMITTEE

This committee, which contributed so much to this year's Geneva program, will have even greater responsibility for the religious education plans for next year. The new committee, appointed by the Western Conference Board, consists of:

Mrs. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford,
Chairman
Mrs. B. A. McClellan, Minneapolis,
Newsletter Editor
Mrs. Harry W. Adams, Kansas City
Mrs. John M. Ely, Cedar Rapids
Mrs. Francis Hughes, Detroit
Mr. Oscar Quimby, Cincinnati
Miss Elizabeth Whitman, St. Paul

GENEVA PROBLEM—HELP!

The major problem at Geneva this year was that of accommodations. The Assembly is assigned certain accommodations on the basis of estimated attendance and past performance. Last year we barely made our minimum guarantee. This year we went beyond our maximum contract allotment. For the Registrar to be able to come anywhere near meeting the wishes of the delegates for accommodations, early registrations are essential. Even early registrants can have difficulties when overcrowding is imminent. This year, for example, on May 10 there were only 62 registrations; on June 9, 140. On June 27 there were 286. The final contract figure had to be determined on June 9. Your officers set the contract figure at 250. The maximum capacity space assigned us was for 270. Only the kind coöperation of College Camp made it possible for us to house everybody, let alone to come anywhere near meeting their desires. And even then some of the week-enders had to sleep off the grounds. Moral: We need to have everybody register as early as possible. This will relieve some of the worries of the Business Manager and will be of great assistance to our ever serene and long-suffering Registrar.

APPEAL RESULTS

Here is how the various areas in the Conference came out in the United Appeal:

Abraham Lincoln Area

Churches making 100% or more 5
Increase in dollars over last year $292.96
Percentage of quota 90%

Michigan Area

Churches making 100% or more 2
Increase in dollars over last year $1,490.20
Percentage of quota 80%

Iowa-Nebraska Area

Churches making 100% or more 1
Increase in dollars over last year $707.87
Percentage of quota 80%

Minnesota Area

Churches making 100% or more 4
Increase in dollars over last year $79.32
Percentage of quota 71%

Colorado Area

Churches making 100% or more 0
Decrease in dollars under last year $135.51
Percentage of quota 68%

Ohio Valley

Churches making 100% or more 1
Decrease in dollars under last year $412.74
Percentage of quota 67%

Chicago Area

Churches making 100% or more 4
Increase in dollars over last year $394.31
Percentage of quota 39%

Unassigned

Churches making 100% or more 0
Dollar increase over last year $234.31
Percentage of quota 33%

Conference Totals

Churches making 100% or more 17
Dollar increase (including special gifts) $5,179.31
Percentage of quota 73%

MIDWEST UNIVERSALIST CONFERENCE

Five Universalist State Conventions—Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin—are pooling their resources to form a Midwest Region of Universalist churches. Rev. John S. MacPhee, minister of the Unitarian-Universalist Church (The Church of the Reconciliation), Utica, New York, has been secured as Executive Director. His headquarters will be at Mukwonago, Wisconsin, where he will also be part-time minister of the Universalist church.

WHERE THEY WERE

Adams, J. L.—Palestine, Europe
Aman, Rex—Northern Minnesota
Argow, W.—Massachusetts
Backus, E. B.—Massachusetts
Clark, T. B.—Maine
Cyrus, J. W.—Maine
Foote, A.—Maine
Gilbert, R.—High Rockies
Hammon, J.—Massachusetts
Hammond, W. D.—Colorado
Hilton, R. S.—New York State
Lawson, R.—Massachusetts
Lyttle, C. H.—Ontario
Pennington, L. T.—Vermont
Pullman, T. M.—Northern Michigan
Reese, C. W.—Kentucky
Robbins, W. W.—Maine
Smith, K. J.—Indiana
Weston, R. T.—Alabama
Westwood, A.—Rhode Island

MADISON

Rev. Max D. Gaebler, minister at Davenport, Iowa, for the past four years, began his ministry of the Madison Unitarian Society on August 1.

URBANA

Services were held during the summer term of the University of Illinois, conducted by John Fordon. Mr. Fordon, a former member of the church, graduated from the Starr King School for the Ministry in June.

CHICAGO-BEVERLY

The Beverly Unitarian Fellowship of Chicago has completely renovated and redecorated the main floor of its building, the Castle. A dedication service for the new quarters was held on June 22. Mr. Arch Winning, Chairman of the Board, conducted the act of dedication. Rev. Hartley C. Ray, minister, preached the sermon. Greetings were given by the Conference Secretary.

WINIFRED DOUTHIT

Miss Winifred Douthit, daughter of the famed Unitarian preacher, Jasper Douthit, died in Shelbyville, Illinois, on May 31. Her influence on the Unitarian ministry has been great. For many years men from Meadville Theological School served as student ministers at Shelbyville. All of them testify to the value of Winifred's sympathetic understanding and benevolent criticism. Rev. Robert A. Storer of Winchester, Massachusetts, in conducting the service said "My own personal memory of her is not so much the many things she said as what she inspired, not so much what her many friends thought of her as the friendship she extended, not so much in what is lost by her passing as what was gained by her living."

MEADVILLE GRADUATES PLACED

All the members of the June graduating class at Meadville Theological School who were looking for ministerial employment have now been placed: Emil Gudmunson to Ellsworth, Maine; Hugo Leaming to Trenton, New Jersey; Eugene Pickett, assistant at Miami, Florida; and John Wolf to the Universalist Church, Racine, Wisconsin.

A Unitarian Choir

A Unitarian choir-O
Must pass a test *de rigueur;*
It is not just that they must sing,
Or that they sing with vigor,

They have to sing the anthem-O
With technical precision
For those who will not sing, themselves,
But greet flaws with derision.

A Unitarian choir-O
May sing only what passes
The critical inspection of
Religious upper classes.

The wording of the anthem-O
Must pass the test of logic
For those whose faith is not so broad
As it is pedagogic.

And hymns the preacher chooses-O,
To match with his oration,
The choir fervently must sing
Without the congregation!

ROBERT T. WESTON.